Vigiliae Christianae 47 (1993), 1-28, E.J. Brill, Leiden

THE TRANSMISSION OF THE TESTAMENTS OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS BY CHRISTIANS

BY

M. DE JONGE

0. Introduction

The so-called Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament are generally studied as Jewish writings; they are regarded as sources for the history and thought of Judaism in the time between 200 before to 100 after the beginning of the common era. Scholars realize, of course, that they were transmitted by Christians; sometimes they were interpolated or redacted more thoroughly, sometimes they were handed down seemingly free from contamination. Research has centered around efforts to reconstruct the earliest Jewish form of these writings with the help of all available critical methods.

Should these pseudepigrapha, however, not also be studied as part of the Christian heritage? They were transmitted because copyists regarded them as important. Transmission presupposes the relevance of what is handed down; this applies to early Christianity as well as to the Middle Ages. Are we in a position to say something about the importance of these writings for Christians in different periods of history, and about their function(s) in Christian circles? In the following pages an effort will be made to answer these questions in the case of one influential pseudepigraphon, much studied in recent times, the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.*

1. Recent studies on the place of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs in the early Church

Rather than giving an exhaustive survey of the recent literature dealing with the relation between the clearly Christian elements and the other passages in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, I may for the sake of brevity refer to my article "The Testaments of the Twelve

Patriarchs: Christian and Jewish. A hundred years after Friedrich Schnapp,"[1] in which the problem is discussed briefly on the basis of a number of earlier studies from my hand. Also § 8 "The Testaments in the Early Church", pp. 67-82 in H. W. Hollander and M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Commentary*[2] offers an informative survey of the problem and the data available for reaching a solution. Since then I have carried the discussion further in two contributions to *Festschriften*; first an article entitled "Die Paränese in den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und in den Testamenten der Zwölf Patriarchen. Einige Überlegungen" written in honour of R. Schnackenburg,[3] and, second, in an essay "Rachel's virtuous behavior in the Testament of Issachar," written for A. J. Malherbe.[4] In so far as the considerations in these studies have a direct bearing on the subject at issue now, they will be discussed in the course of the present article.

2. The medieval witnesses to the text of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs

2.0 This paper is intended to investigate the transmission of the Testaments in the early Church. Yet it is thanks to the fact that also Christians from later ages were interested in these writings that they have come down to us at all. The Greek manuscripts, our primary witnesses to the text of the Testaments, date from the end of the tenth century (Cambridge, Univ. Library, Ff I.24, ff. 203r.-261v. = *b*) up to the eighteenth century (Mt. Sinai, Monastery of St. Catherine, Cod. Gr. 2170 (= 608), ff. 8r.-88r. = *j*, the last of a series of three closely related manuscripts in this monastery, and the Modern Greek translation in Bibl. Acad. Bucharest, Cod. Gr. 508 (341), ff. 7r.-120r. = Ngr).[5] It is obvious that we have to look in the Greek codices for indications why the text was transcribed. But first we have to give our attention to the data relating to the transfer of the oldest manuscript of the Testaments, the codex *b* just mentioned, to the West and its translation into Latin.

2.1 Robert Grosseteste (ca. 1170-1253) and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs

Around 1242 Robert Grosseteste, bishop of Lincoln, translated the Testaments from Greek into Latin, with the assistance of a certain Nicholas the Greek. Shortly before, he had sent John of Basingstoke to

Greece with the purpose of tracking down the Greek Testaments. In the Leiden volume *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* H. J. de Jonge has given extensive information on this,[6] and the present author has been able to supply some additional information in a recent study.[7]

For this paper I concentrate on two clearly related data: the reports on the finding of the Testaments and their translation in the Chronicle of Grosseteste's contemporary Matthew Paris[8] as well as in the colophon which occurs already in a thirteenth-century manuscript of the Latin translation[9] and must have been added at a very early date—possibly already by Nicholas the Greek, like Matthew attached to the Abbey of St. Albans. Some matters are brought emphatically to the fore there.

In the first place, attention is repeatedly drawn to the many and distinct prophecies concerning Christ which are to be found in the Testaments. Matthew Paris mentions the "manifestas quae in eisdem patent de Christo Prophetias"[10] and the colophon "luculentae ('clear, reliable') prophetiae, quae in hoc scripto, luce clarius, coruscant ('glow, sparkle')." Matthew Paris adds that the Testaments are indisputably "de substantia Bibliothecae." "Bibliotheca" is a designation of the Bible current in the Middle Ages. In his opinion, the Testaments clearly contained "biblical material". Of course they did not as such belong to the canonical writings, but as to their substance they certainly ranked among them.

Why had these important witnesses concerning Christ remained hidden for such a long time? The colophon blames this on the Jews, and speaks about "invidia Iudaeorum, qui ea propter evidentissimas et manifestissimas, ac crebras de Christo prophetias, quae in iis scribuntur, diu occultaverunt," and Matthew Paris uses much the same terms.[11] That explains why many learned and wise men in the Church never quoted the Testaments. We owe it to the Greeks, "omnium scriptorum diligentissimi investigatores", that this writing has been translated from Hebrew into Greek[12] and was preserved over a long time so that now, thanks to Robert Grosseteste, it could radiate its glorious light, intended "ad robur fidei Christianae et ad majorem Judaeorum confusionem."[13]

Robert Grosseteste *cum suis* evidently used the Testaments to make abundantly clear to Jews and all possible adversaries of the true doctrine that salvation is to be expected exclusively from Jesus Christ and from

the true Church that abides by Scripture. As early as 1253 Vincent of Beauvais incorporated excerpts from the Testaments in his *Speculum Historiale* because of their extremely clear and utterly beautiful prophecies concerning Christ, "quas nuper transtulit magister robertus grossum caput, lincolniensis episcopus de greco in latinum".[14] Bonaventura, too, in his Commentary on the Sententiae from 1250-1252[15] already quotes from the Testaments in Grosseteste's Latin translation, which in view of the number of transmitted manuscripts (no less than fifteen from the thirteenth century alone) must have been very popular from the start.

Highly interesting, finally, are two references to the Testaments in Roger Bacon's *Opus Majus* from 1266-1268,[16] in which he elaborates Matthew Paris's brief remark "quae constat esse de substantia Bibliothecae". In Pars II, cap. XVI he says that patriarchs and prophets have written other books beside those that are included in the Holy Scripture; books which, though not incorporated in the canon, have been used by "sancti et sapientes Graeci et Latini" right from the beginning of the Church.[17] Indeed did not Judas, for instance, already use Enoch in his Epistle (vv. 14-15)? We may, therefore, assign authority to the prophecies concerning Christ which proved to be correct. Elsewhere, in Pars VII, cap. IV[18] he says: If one objects that those writings are apocryphal and that therefore their authorship is not established, one should remember: "hoc non tollit veritatem quia libri hi recipiuntur a Graecis, Latinis, et Judaeis." The addition "Judaeis" here deserves special attention. Much as the Jews may have tried to suppress the witness of their patriarchs, in the final analysis the Christians are dependent on their tradition. In a letter from 1231 Grosseteste quotes St. Augustine's exegesis of Ps. 58:12 in the Vulgate, in which this Church Father argues that it is not allowed to kill the Jews, because they "portant codices nostros, de quibus prophetatus et promissus est nobis Christus". Indeed, Grosseteste continues, "ac per hoc sunt testes fidei Christianae contra infidelitatem Paganorum."[19]

2.2 Indications in Greek manuscripts

In a great number of Greek manuscripts we find additions in the margin, and occasionally also in the text, which, contrary to the equally frequent omissions,[20] give us information on the intention of the scribes involved. Frequently[21] we find in the margin the gloss περὶ χριστοῦ, not

surprising after what just has been remarked about Grosseteste c.s. In Ms *m* (= Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ms Gr. 60, pp. 339-482), dating from the second half of the sixteenth century, we find at the end of the Testament of Benjamin (therefore at the end of the Testaments) the note

> καὶ προσπάγητε πάντα πρὸς νόμον κυρίου καὶ κριτοῦ τῶν ἁπάντων, ἵνα εὕρητε αὐτὸν ἵλεων, ὅταν ἥξῃ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καὶ γενηθήσεται ὥσπερ νήπιον ἐκ γυναικός· καὶ αὐτὸς δίδαξει ἡμᾶς πᾶσαν διδαχὴν πνευματικὴν ἐν ταπεινώσει, καὶ παθῶν παρὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἕως μέχρι ἀναληφθῆναι εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς καὶ πάλιν ἐρχόμενος μετὰ δόξης κρῖναι τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ. ("And be in everything connected with the law of the Lord and the Judge of the universe, that you will find him merciful when he comes from heaven and is born of a woman as a small child. And he will teach you all spiritual teachings in humility, and, having suffered on the part of the Jews until his assumption into the heavens, return with glory to pass judgment on Israel in justice and truth").

This passage substitutes a much more extensive testamentary final passage in T. B. 10,2-11 (in which the response of the patriarch's descendants to Jesus as human being on earth and his future judgment figure prominently) as well as chapter 11 (in which "a beloved of the Lord" of Benjamin's seed comes on the scene). It is followed by an abridged version of the final chapter T. B. 12, which also occurs in virtually the same form in Ms *d* (= Cod. Vat. Gr. 1238, ff. 350r-379v; saec. XII). T. B. 11, by the way, has, for obvious reasons, in another manuscript, *l* (= Athos, Laura I 48 [cat. no. 1132], ff. 204r-276r; saec. XVI-XVII) the marginal note περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου ἀποστόλου Παύλου· καὶ γὰρ ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς αὐτοῦ ἦν.[22]

It is relevant here to dwell for a moment on three manuscripts: *b* (the one used by Grosseteste); *d*, just mentioned, a manuscript from Calabria written in 1195[23]; and *k* (= Venice, S. Marc. Cod. Gr. Z. 494 (= 331]), a manuscript containing excerpts from the Testaments on ff. 263r-264v., and dating from the middle of the thirteenth century.

In the case of *b* attention should be called to four marginal notes. T. R. 6,8 carries προφητεία περὶ χῦ; T.S. 6,7 προφητεία περὶ τῆς ἐνσάρκου οἰκονομίας; T.L. 2,10 περὶ τοῦ χῦ and T.L. 4,1 πε<ρὶ> τῆς σταυρώσεως τοῦ χῦ λέγ<εται>. It is possible, though not absolutely certain, that these glosses stem from the author of the manuscript himself.[24]

An interesting case is *d*. Not only did the writer of the text add περὶ τοῦ χριστοῦ in the margin some thirty times, but in addition to this we find four Greek *marginalia* by a later hand, consisting of T.R. 6,8.11-12; T. Jud. 23,5; 24,1-2; T.G. 7,1; 8,1; T.A. 7,2-3.3-4, the text of which

does not correspond with the text of the manuscript itself. In all cases it is a matter of Christological passages, and in all cases we find (shorter) Latin passages added; the text of the latter corresponds with that of fragments incorporated in the *Speculum Historiale* of Vincent of Beauvais, mentioned in the preceding section. H. J. de Jonge, who has carried out a thorough investigation into the matter, concludes that the choice and the extent of the marginal notes (not the text itself) are determined by the Latin fragments in Vincent of Beauvais's book. Vincent, as we have seen was above all fascinated by the "apertissimae atque pulcherrimae de christo prophetiae" in the Testaments.[25]

Finally there are the fragments in *k*. First rather long ones, with a general introduction, from T. Reuben, T. Simeon and T. Levi, but with T. Judah things begin to change. Although the introduction announces that the testament is concerned with courage and avarice, the excerpt proper is limited to T. Jud 21,7-end in an abridged version, characterised as περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τῶν υἱῶν αὐτοῦ. Nothing has been taken over from T. Issachar, for, as the introduction tells us, οὗτος οὐδέν τι περὶ τοῦ χριστοῦ ἐφθέγξατο. All of the other seven excerpts restrict themselves to the eschatological passages at the end of the Testaments; the introductions briefly mention the parenesis in the testament concerned, and then announce what the patriarch had to say about the Christ. Interestingly the final exhortation about the "pure disposition" in T.B. 8 is incorporated.[26] It is clear that the scribe of these excerpts, or possibly already the writer of his *Vorlage*, was first of all interested in the Christological passages.

Summarizing: the data in the Greek manuscripts known to us point in the same direction as the reports about Grosseteste and his contemporaries. All users of the Testaments were concerned with references to Christ.

2.3 The ethical exhortations in the Testaments

The Testaments are, however, distinctly a parenetic writing, as is evident from their structure and design. Could so obvious a fact have escaped the scholars in the Middle Ages and later? This is a point that clearly requires further investigation.

H. J. de Jonge, however, pointed out to me that the East Middle Dutch translation (from Latin) of the Testaments, which we have in three mutually independent manuscripts,[27] has clearly been transmitted with

parenetic intentions. This is evident from the short prologue and epilogue with which the translator provided the writing. Thus he says, at the end: "Here end the sermons and the testaments of the twelve patriarchs children of Jacob the patriarch which they made at the very end of their lives in which they narrate a part of their lives with a variety of good examples and teaching which they taught to their children and commanded to practise."[28]

We may take it for granted that this translation was made in circles of adherents of the Modern Devotion, a movement that has produced a vast body of literature in the vernacular aimed at the *praxis pietatis.* In one of the manuscripts (Nijmegen, Gemeentearchief, Weeshuis no. 957) we find, besides the Testaments, the text of a Dutch translation of *De spiritualibus* ("Van der opclimminghen") from the hand of Gerard Zerbolt van Zutphen († 1398, a prominent pupil of Geert Grote).[29]

There is yet another Dutch translation, made in 1538. Its oldest Dutch printing dates from 1541, published by Albertus Palfraet in Deventer. All of its five or six printings between 1541 and ca. 1550 appeared in Overijssel, in the East of the Netherlands; after 1551 the translation appears in all sorts of editions in the Southern Netherlands.[30] C. C. de Bruin and H. J. de Jonge have associated them with the chiliastic movement of David Joris (active in the Netherlands between ca. 1528 and 1540). This would explain why this translation was put on the index of prohibited books.[31]

In any case the readers of this second translation were not only interested in the parenetic parts but also in the prophecies in the Testaments. On the title page of the edition that appeared in 1544 with Pieter Warnerszoon in Kampen we read: "The testaments of the XII patriarchs Jacob's children, how each before his end taught his children (to live in) the fear of the Lord and exhorted (them) to live a God-fearing life. Also how each particularly through the prophetic spirit witnessed to Christ the true Messiah (clearer than that light). In which are contained much magnificent teaching and many consoling promises by Christ very consoling and altogether inducive to a God-fearing life."[32] It is significant that precisely the second half of this passage (from "Also how each.." onward) is omitted on the title pages of the three printings of the Testaments by Plantijn, dating from 1561, 1564 and 1566.[33] Plantijn—also, by the way, the printer of the Index (1570)—evidently thought it well-advised to omit the reference to the prophetic spirit.

These forms of reception of the Testaments, in the Netherlands and elsewhere, deserve more attention. One could, for instance, assume with good reason, that in the monasteries in which the Testaments were transcribed, in the East as well as in the West, the ethical content of this writing was well received. But within the scope of this paper we have to go back from the Middle Ages to, in the end, the early Church. What can be said, on the basis of the transmission in the Middle Ages, about that in the preceding period?

3. The Testaments prior to the tenth century

3.1 The transition from uncial to minuscule

Our oldest Greek textual witness Ms. *b* dates from the end of the tenth century. As the Leiden research has established, it belongs, together with Ms. *k.* to one small family, called family I. All other textual witnesses (including the Armenian, Slavonic and Serbian translations) belong to family II. How old, then, is the archetype of the tradition known to us?

H. J. de Jonge, who has made a substantial contribution to the reconstruction of the *stemma codicum* employed in the Leiden *editio maior*,[34] devoted an important article to this question in the volume *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (1975).[35] On the basis of an examination of thirteen passages showing different readings in fam. I and fam. II, he concludes that the Testaments were transcribed not once but twice in the ninth century, when the transition was made from uncial to minuscule. In fact, the variants concerned can best be explained on the basis of a wrong or at least divergent reading of uncial script. If the Testaments were transcribed from uncial to minuscule script two times, the odds are that also two different uncial manuscripts were used. And if this is the case, the archetype of the textual tradition known to us must go back beyond the ninth century. How far back it is impossible to establish.

3.2 The Armenian translation

The next question to be considered is whether the translations from Greek into other languages help us to trace an older stage of textual tradition. As a case in point we may mention the example of the Testament of Job, transmitted in three Greek manuscripts, the oldest of which

dates from the eleventh century,[36] and that of the Testament of Abraham, a writing with a very intricate textual tradition but equally lacking a Greek manuscript older than the eleventh century.[37] We now have a fragmentary Coptic version of both Testaments, found in the fifth-century P. Colon. Inv. no. 3221.[38] Unfortunately this version has as yet not been published, nor has it been incorporated in theories about the transmission of the text of T. Job and T. Abraham, but it is clearly of utmost importance.

In the case of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs efforts have been made to go farther back by means of the Armenian translation, known in more than fifty manuscripts and clearly very popular in the Armenian church. In an article from 1969[39] C. Burchard dated the translation to the sixth or seventh century on the strength of the kind of Armenian employed, and M. E. Stone concurred.[40] To prove this, however, turned out to be far from easy.

The earliest Armenian manuscripts date from the thirteenth century,[41] and the oldest list of sacred writings mentioning the Testaments is that of Johannes Sarkawag of Halbat (1045/55-1129?). Burchard says that Johannes knew the Testaments in Armenian, but M. E. Stone believes it quite possible that he quoted a list of Greek writings.[42] If this is so he cannot be adduced as an indubitable witness for the Armenian text of the Testaments.

The place of the Armenian translation in the *stemma codicum* is reasonably certain.[43] It belongs to fam. II and, like *eafchij*Ngr and the Slavonic translation, it has an abridged, secondary text in T. Zebulun.[44] It does not share many other secondary readings in that group, but shows many points of similarity with (manuscripts belonging to) subfamily *gldm*Fm^{d}; consequently A has to be situated between these two subfamilies. The oldest witness for the short version of T. Zebulun is *e* (= Ms. Athos, Koutloumous 39 [cat. no. 3108], ff. 198r-229v), a manuscript dating from the eleventh century. It is not certain when the abridgment was made, but as regards the Greek material it need not have been before the tenth or eleventh century. In 1975 I therefore concluded, referring to H. J. de Jonge's argument concerning the transliteration from uncial to minuscule script: "The Armenian translation is very unlikely to be earlier than the IXth century. We should be cautious, therefore, to put the Armenian translation in the VIth or VIIth century on the basis of the impression made by its language alone. Surely the possibility may not be excluded that some scribe at a later

date deliberately used classical or classicizing language for a writing like the Testaments which purported to come from ancient times. What we really need is unequivocal early external evidence for A."[45]

Research has, of course, continued. Two persons in particular who have contributed to it deserve special mention. I briefly mention A. Hultgård, who in his *L'eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches II*,[46] 11-52 extensively discussed the textual problems of the Testaments with special attention for the position of the Armenian translation. He assumes four textual types: *bk, gldm, eafnchij*SNGr and A, which independently go back to archetypes from the third or fourth century. For the reconstruction of the archetype we need all four types, and consequently also the Armenian version;[47] obviously they existed already before the ninth century—even though Hultgård cannot adduce evidence for transliteration in the case of *gldm* and *eafnchij*, and his arguments for the dependence of A on a Greek text written in uncials are not convincing.

In any case he considers A as very important for the reconstruction of the oldest Greek text. In agreement with M. E. Stone, he says that in general the Armenian version offers a shorter text and occasionally redacts radically; this will have been so right from the beginning of the translation in the fifth or sixth century, and will have continued subsequently. All the same Hultgård uses singular Armenian readings whenever it suits him; as I have tried to demonstrate elsewhere, his text-critical analysis is not very precise, methodically speaking; and now and then he handles criteria of internal criticism in a very subjective manner.

More important than Hultgård's contribution is that of Stone in a recent article.[48] In the oldest Armenian manuscript on paper, Erevan, Matenadaran no. 2679, dating from 981, we find on ff. 251r-252r excerpts from the Testaments. Though unimportant as to their literary value for lack of a clear line and purpose, these excerpts are very important from the point of view of textual history and textual criticism. This "Epitome" (as Stone calls it) gives a text that is not directly dependent on that of any of the other witnesses which can be divided into four textual types.[49] Stone reconstructs a simple *stemma*, and concludes that prior to the Epitome not only an archetype, but also a hyparchetype has to be assumed. There are, moreover, quite a few contaminations, and he therefore concludes: "Since the *Epitome* is as old as the oldest Greek witness, its ancestor must be older, perhaps notably older than that. This implies that the *Vorlage* of Armenian on the Greek stemma is most

likely of the eighth century or earlier and in any case no later than the early ninth century at the very latest."[50] It is clear that the first half of the ninth century just fits in with H. J. de Jonge's reconstruction of the transliteration process, whereas an earlier dating leads to considerable difficulties. Yet Stone, on stylistic grounds, is very much inclined to assume an earlier date. He gives no details but refers to the judgment of archbishop Norair Bogharian, "one of the great scholars of Armenian of the generation" who, in a conversation, "pointed to the absence from *Testament of Levi* of the stratum of Armenian vocabulary that entered the language as a result of the influence of the stylistic aberrations of the Philo-Hellene school of the late fifth and early sixth centuries."[51] We therefore have to allow for a translation made in the fifth century, but Stone remains cautious, aware of having to assume more than two transliterations in that case. He knows that this is extremely difficult to prove; but, he says, what cannot be demonstrated may for all that have taken place.

My conclusion is that we have to wait for unequivocal quotations from or allusions to the Testaments in the writings of early Armenain authors. With all due respect, it would seem to me that arguments on the strength of vocabulary or style are tenuous, because this kind of narrative and exhortative literature, in which moreover the sons of Jacob are purported to speak, has its own peculiar style and vocabulary.

In conclusion there is one other point deserving to be mentioned briefly. The Armenian version shows the tendency to shorten the text, even more so than the Greek manuscripts that have abbreviations. The textcritical rule *lectio brevior potior* certainly does not hold good for the Testaments, in any case not where divergencies of this kind are concerned. Needless to say that this means that even where we have to do with redacted Christian passages the shorter, less "Christian", Armenian text is not closer to the original.[52]

4. Are there traces of non-Christian transmission of the Testaments or of traditions incorporated in the Testaments?

4.1. Some remarks on Jubilees and Enoch

The discovery of small Hebrew fragments of Jubilees and Aramaic ones of Enoch in the caves near Qumran has deservedly attracted a lot of attention. The former writing had up to then been known in an Ethiopic version, a fragmentary Latin one (incidentally, from a

manuscript from the *sixth* century), Syriac fragments and Greek quotations—and all of a sudden much earlier, unmistakably Jewish fragments in Hebrew came at our disposal. For 1 Enoch we had to rely on an Ethiopic text, Greek quotations, (large) Greek fragments—and now, unexpectedly we were able to supplement them with undubitably Jewish Aramaic material. In both cases it was a matter of very small fragments, identified and often partly reconstructed by means of the existing versions.

With some caution because of the extremely limited range of material, James VanderKam concluded in 1977: "The text of Jub. which the Ethiopic manuscripts provide is very accurate and reliable. It reproduces the Hebrew text (*via* a Greek intermediate stage) literally and precisely in nearly all cases."[53] In the case of 1 Enoch the material is also restricted. According to the count made by M. A. Knibb,[54] the Aramaic material involves no more than 196 out of the 1062 verses of the Ethiopic Enoch, and in a great many cases only parts of these verses. In general there is agreement between the Aramaic and the Greek and Ethiopic, but sometimes the Aramaic gives a longer text, and there is also Aramaic material that cannot be connected with anything in the other versions. There are also other indications that the Enoch corpus of Qumran looked different from what is now in the Ethiopic version. As is well-known, Qumran has yielded as yet no fragments of the Parables of Enoch in 1 Enoch 37-71, and J. T. Milik has found fragments which he ascribed to a "Book of Giants" to which he assigned a place in the earliest form of the "Enochic Pentateuch".

In the case of Jubilees the Hebrew fragments may be used as a very valuable early textual witness for the reconstruction of the earliest attainable text of this writing. In the case of 1 Enoch the matter is considerably more difficult; there is, as it would seem, not necessarily merely one earliest attainable text.[55]

4.2 The situation with regard to the Testaments, in particular T. Levi

What is the situation with respect to the Testaments? Ever since finishing my dissertation I have kept myself abreast of new findings at Qumran, since I was continually cautioned that my theory of a Christian origin of the Testaments would be refuted the moment a fragment of the Testaments would surface at Qumran. In the over-confidence of youth I predicted, at the time, that this was extremely unlikely. In my

book I had after all already extensively discussed Aramaic Levi-fragments discovered in the famous Cairo Genizah, as well as a long Greek fragment in Ms. *e*, the eleventh century Ms. Koutloumous 39 (already mentioned) which corresponded with it. I had demonstrated that in the Greek Testament of Levi in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs we have to do with a thorough Christian redaction of a *Vorlage* related to the Aramaic and Greek material.[56] Indeed the fragments of Ar. Levi found at Qumran (as far as they have been published) partly correspond with the Aramaic fragments already known and partly run surprisingly parallel to a second addition in Ms. *e*. Furthermore, Milik announced in 1956 the forthcoming publication of a Hebrew fragment containing a genealogy of Bilhah in a form longer than that found in T.N. 1,6-12—a passage that is anyhow an excursus in that testament. So far only a small part of this fragment has been published.[57]

Twice in the recent past I have arranged and analysed all data known so far. Once in § 3 of the Introduction in the commentary on the Testaments by Hollander and myself,[58] and once in a contribution to the *Mémorial Jean Carmignac* entitled "The Testament of Levi and the 'Aramaic Levi' ".[59] In order to avoid burdening the reader with further details, I shall restrict myself in this paper to a broad outline, and to those conclusions that are relevant to our purpose.

a. The various Aramaic fragments (as regards content supplemented with the Greek ones) in the final analysis go back to only one writing. We can roughly estimate its content, probably approximately in the order now found in T. Levi. The beginning and the end are missing, and consequently we remain in the dark as to the literary genre of this presumed basic document.

b. We can, however, discern distinct parallels with the instructions from the person concerned to his son/sons, contained in 4Q Qahat and 4Q ʿAmram—and in the case of the latter clearly connected with the moment of his demise. Qahat appeals to his father Levi. It is therefore a matter of instructions (and prophecies) transmitted from generation to generation in priestly circles—and for that reason important for the Qumran sect. According to a number of scholars Ar. Levi would date from the third century B.C.

c. It is as yet not clear how the scribe of Ms. *e* could have laid hands on a Greek Levi-text corresponding with the Aramaic fragments and on various points more elaborate than these. The first insertion in *e* forms

a unity: it gives a prayer of Levi with a short introduction. It is, albeit somewhat awkwardly, inserted at the place in T. Levi that corresponds with that in the original context, as is shown by the new Aramaic fragment. The same goes for a small addition in T.L. 5,2. The third fragment has a distinct beginning, but breaks off abruptly in a biographic passage where the corresponding Aramaic fragment continues. In this case the Greek scribe probably had no complete text. He also inserted it at an awkward place, neither here nor earlier trying to really connect the passages in hand with the context into which he introduced them.

We are concerned here with an indubitably Jewish tradition in a Greek text that goes back to an Aramaic original. We are completely in the dark as to the writer and the date of translation, when it came into Christian hands and who transmitted it, in fragmentary form, together with the text of the Testaments but ultimately unconnected with them. It is, however, important to establish that the Greek translation can have been made and have circulated in Jewish circles at a relatively early date.

d. The Testament of Levi in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs is incontestably one of the twelve testaments, even though it differs considerably as regards its content. In my opinion this is due to the availability of such a vast quantity of interesting material from a Levi document very similar to the one underlying the Aramaic and Greek Levi fragments just mentioned. It may also have been known in Greek. However this may be, the extant document was abridged and drastically redacted; in my article in the *Mémorial Carmignac* I have, referring to earlier publications, attempted to demonstrate that "the present T. Levi is thoroughly Christian, but at the same time it acknowledges the special position of Levi and his tribe, the sacrificial cult (though it pays very little attention to it) and the Temple in Jerusalem in the time before the arrival of Jesus Christ" (p. 382).

e. It is interesting to note that the redactors of the Levi material also retained matters which, though perhaps of some interest to the readers, had lost their topicality. Thus T. Levi 9 gives a very short version of the rules for the priesthood passed on by Isaac to Levi, which in the fragments are represented in a very elaborate and detailed form. It is remarkable that not only a warning against πορνεία has been retained—which fits very well in the parenesis of the Testaments—but also the ban on marrying a Gentile woman; this is followed by a number of purification rules connected with sacrifices. The author mentions them since in

this case it concerns precepts for Levitical priests, in force in the time the narrative is said to have taken place and afterwards; the sons of Levi will exercise their function till the coming of Christ (T.L. 4,4; 5,2; 8,11-15; T.R. 6,8). However strong the emphasis in the parenesis is on these precepts and on the Law to be practised by all, Jews and non-Jews alike, there is none the less an awareness of those elements in the Old Testament which are specifically connected with Israel or with the priesthood, and from the chosen pseudepigraphical perspective these were taken into account.

The conclusion reached in this section is then: there are no traces of a non-Christian transmission of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. We can, however, establish that tradition material used in the Testaments had also been transmitted earlier in Jewish circles.

5. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs in the second century

5.1 The Testaments between the third and the eighth century

The first Christian author to quote the Testaments is Origen in his homilies on Joshua (transmitted in Latin only).[60] While not considering them canonical ("sed in aliquo quodam libello, qui appellatur testamentum duodecim patriarcharum, quamvis non habeatur in canone"), he yet thinks that they have sensible things to say. Referring to T. Reuben 2-3, he continues: "talem quendam invenimus sensum, quod per singulos peccantes singuli satanae intelligi debeant." Origen clearly attributes at least some authority to the Testaments. On the strength of this reference we have to consider the beginning of the third century as *terminus ad quem* for them. On the basis of parallels (to be discussed presently) with other authors from the last half of the second century and the beginning of the third (Justin, Irenaeus, Hippolytus), it is likely that they came into being at the end of the second century.

The reference in Origen is unmistakably vague as to the content of the passage involved; the same applies to that to T.N. 2,8 in Jerome, *Tractatus de Psalmo* 15.[61] These references give us no certainty as to the exact contents of the Testaments known to both authors. Are there possibilities to give a more specific picture of the developments between ca. 200 and ca. 700 (assuming that the present textual tradition in any case goes back to an eighth century archetype)?

One thing is certain: textual criticism leaves us in the lurch at this point. For instance: at the end of T. Dan 7 verse 3 is plainly a later addi-

tion. After the conclusion of the testament in 7,2 with the words "and his sons buried him, and afterwards they brought up his bones (to bury them) near Abraham, Isaac and Jacob", the text continues with the words: "But, as Dan prophesied to them, that they would forget the law of their God, and be alienated from the land of their inheritance and from the race of Israel and their family and offspring, so it came to pass." This is clearly a gloss, but all the same it is present in the entire manuscript tradition, and as to its contents not completely without parallel in the Testaments—witness T. Asher 7,6: "Therefore you will be scattered as Gad and Dan, my brothers, who will not know their lands and tribe and tongue." If we consider this verse as a later addition, we do so on the strength of the conviction that this verse does not fit in the composition pattern of the Testaments. We cannot ascertain when this gloss found its way into the text.

Can we identify more deviations from the composition pattern? Not, I think, with any certainty. The Testaments consist of farewell discourses, with a distinct beginning and a distinct end, devoted to the parenesis from the moribund patriarch to his children and grandchildren; they are illustrated with biographical material and end in prophecies concerning the future of the patriarchs' childeren and grandchildren. Occasionally we come across a great amount of haggadic material, as in the case of Levi—for which we have a parallel document—or in the case of Judah, where we find traditions about wars of Jacob's sons with the Canaanites, transmitted in Jubilees and elsewhere.[62] We may rightfully assume that the content of the Testaments was at their conception also determined by the tradition material available in written and/or oral form. But since we often cannot resort to external witnesses, we can at times only conjecture about the sources. In T. Joseph, for instance, which (just like T. Levi and T. Judah) is considerably longer than the other nine testaments, there are two cycles of stories, one about Joseph and Potiphar's wife (chs. 3-9) and one about Joseph's arrest and captivity (chapters 11-16). Both cycles have been made instrumental to the parenesis of the testament.[63] We do not know the origin of this haggadic material; nor whether its incorporation in the Testaments took place in one or more stages. Nor can we adduce any conclusive argument about *later* additions to the parenetic or biographical material to the Testaments in the time after Origen.[64]

5.2 The Christological passages

Will we, perhaps, be more successful if we turn to the eschatological/Christological passages? In view of the results of our analysis of the medieval transmission, it is obvious that we would have to look there for possible later additions. Transcribers will often have been unable to resist the temptation to dot the i's and cross the t's. The problem is, however, to prove they did so, and to date these additions.

In three recent publications[65] I have tried to demonstrate that in spite of everything there is considerable coherence and consistence in the pronouncements on the future, and on the role of Jesus Christ in that future. But at the same time we come across divergencies (in all the various types of passages about the future) and unexpected turns. May these, perhaps, be explained as commentaries or additions from different periods, before as well as after Origen? Do we have here indications that also the Testaments belong to what Robert Kraft has called "evolving literature"?[66]

While endorsing this in theory, we yet have to admit that in practice it actually gets us nowhere, since it is only with great caution that we are allowed to apply our modern criteria of consistency. We find, for instance, both "adoptianistic" and "patripassianistic" pronouncements in the Testaments. Thus in T. Levi 16,3 we read about "a man who renews the Law in the power of the Most High", whom the sons of Levi will call a deceiver (πλανός). T.L. 18,6-7 and T. Jud. 24,2 refer to the story of Jesus' baptism in the Jordan. But in T.L. 5,2 God announces that he himself is going to live in the midst of Israel, and 4,1 gives a description of the mighty things that are going to happen "at the suffering of the Most High". T. Jud. 22,2 mentions "the coming (παρουσία) of the God of righteousness", but shortly afterwards we read in 24,1 "and from my seed a man will arise like the sun of righteousness, walking with the sons of men in meekness and righteousness, and no sin whatever will be found in him."

It remains a moot question whether one is allowed to apply strict dogmatic standards to the Testaments such as have been refined in later theological debates. Implicitly referring to nineteenth-century discussions about the possibility of either a Jewish Christian origin of the Testaments or a gentile Christian one (a distinction very current at the time[67]), I concluded in my dissertation[68] (on the basis of these and many other examples) that the author could freely employ "adoptianistic"

and "patripassianistic" utterances because he was not aware of their one-sidednesses and liabilities. I also pointed out the great variety in Christology in the second century, when what later was to be called "heterodox" and "orthodox" could still occur side by side in the work of one author. "It must ... be borne in mind that in c. 200 A.D. the dogmatic controversy about the nature of Christ, and the attempts to create a well-defined Christological terminology, had only just started." Moreover, the Testaments were concerned with parenesis for a broad public rather than with Christology for connoisseurs; also the available oral and written tradition was of influence,[69] as were various Old Testament motifs. The exact terminology the patriarchs used was less important than the fact that they announced whom the church professed as its Lord and Master. Given this variety in Christology from the start, it is impossible to use Christological variants for tracing later additions (not to mention redactions) in the Testaments.

To bring this matter to a close: In view of the many references to Jesus Christ and the particular attention paid to Israel's response to him and to the way in which Israel could participate in the salvation brought about by him, we cannot but posit that to the author(s) of the Testaments the words of the patriarchs were important as an announcement of their own situation. Continuity in the history of salvation was assumed; the Jewish Scriptures were taken very seriously and concomitant traditions were readily adopted. Both, the writings of the Old Testament as well as the traditions connected with them, were interpreted in a Christian fashion.[70]

In order to situate the Testaments in the early church more precisely we shall have to pay special attention to the earliest forms of exegesis of Scripture. In this connection I have examined the work of the first commentator of the Bible whose writings are known to us, Hippolytus of Rome, and in particular his commentary on Genesis 49 and Deuteronomy 33.[71] This investigation did not result in a great amount of direct parallels—but it did (among other things) lead to the important insight that to Hippolytus and his readers Jesus was obviously to be connected with Levi as well as with Judah. And furthermore it became clear in the course of this study, with how great an inventiveness biblical data were interpreted in such a way that they could throw light on Christian ideas. Exegetical treatises like those of Hippolytus show early Christianity as a community reading and interpreting Scripture—often very much *ad hoc* and unsystematically.

It is an interesting point that the Testaments pay special attention to the relationship between Israel and Jesus as the redeemer of non-Jews and Jews. In the next section more will be said about this.

5.3 The function of the ethical exhortations in the Testaments within early Christianity

First and foremost, the Testaments give ethical instructions, to be followed by the descendants of the patriarch till the end of time. The ethics of the Testaments show influence of the Psalms and Wisdom books of the LXX, especially those only transmitted in the Greek Bible. The Cynic-Stoic philosophers offer many parallels. Only occasionally the best, or even only parallels are found in Christian sources. This has been shown convincingly by H. W. Hollander in his study on Joseph as a typical "good man" and as ethical model in the Testaments.[72] He consequently looked for the author in a circle of Wisdom teachers or in a Hellenistic-Jewish school. The ethical passages give little support to the thesis that the author was a *Christian* coming from a Hellenistic-Jewish circle.

In the chapter on "The Common Ethic" in his *Between Athens and Jerusalem*[73] J. J. Collins arrives at the same conclusion. "Ultimately the ethics of the Testaments cannot be pinpointed as the product of a specific situation. They are of interest for our purpose as material which seems to have accumulated and circulated in Hellenized Jewish circles over two hundred years and was eventually taken over by Christianity." Here and in other writings originating from the Diaspora, the specific and exclusively Jewish elements are pushed into the background, and current philosophical-ethical notions have been adapted to an overall Jewish religious scheme of reference. On this point we may compare *Gesetz und Paränese* by K.-W. Niebuhr,[74] in which he searches for "Katechismusartige Reihen für die Gesetzesparänese" and draws the conclusion that it is not only in the Testaments that we find a "geprägte paränetische Tradition des Frühjudentums", but also in Philo, *Hypothetica* 7,1-9, in Josephus, *Contra Apionem* 2, 190-219 and in Pseudo-Phocylides.

Personally, I have over the last few years learned to emphasize the fact that in the field of ethics there has been a considerable measure of continuity between Hellenized Judaism and certain circles in early Christianity.[75] All sorts of utterances in the Testaments are simply

Jewish as well as Christian, and totally acceptable to the non-Jewish and non-Christian Hellenistic fellow-citizens of the author(s) and readers of the Testaments.

I tried to show this in my essay "Rachel's Virtuous Behaviour in the Testament of Issachar" mentioned above.[76] Here I discussed the pronouncement in T. Iss. 2,1 on sexual continence (ἐγκρατεία), also within marriage, and the thesis in 2,3 that sexual intercourse ought to be practised with the purpose of begetting children rather than for the lust of pleasure (φιληδονία). There are interesting parallels here in statements of philosophers (e.g. Musonius Rufus and Seneca), of Josephus in his description of the Essenes in B.J. 2 §§ 119-166, of Philo (very numerous), and also in Christian sources from the second century, specifically in the Sentences of Sextus. Others, too, in particular Clement of Alexandria, offer a lot of material on this subject.

Particularly with regard to the ethics of the Testaments we do well to approach with utmost caution the thesis that what is not manifestly Christian stems from an earlier Jewish version of the Testaments. We are not free to regard the ethical pronouncements in the Testaments as expressions of an "open" type of Judaism from which early Christianity should have originated. The Testaments prove that there has been continuity between Hellenistic-Jewish and Christian parenesis; it is not impossible that also ethical pronouncements only received their present form at the final moulding of the Testaments in Christian circles.[77]

The continuity between the ethics of the patriarchs and that of the believers in the time after Jesus Christ is strikingly supported theologically, i.e. with respect to the history of salvation, in the words of early Christian thinkers like Justin, Irenaeus and Tertullian.[78] In the light of their statements on the faith of the patriarchs and their obedience to God in the time before Moses, and on the concentration on the Decalogue and the two great commandments as their summary after the coming of Christ, it becomes clear why exactly the parenetical testaments of Jacob's sons should become authoritative for Christians of the second century and later. The Testaments indicated what God's commandments really were and are about; then, in the days of Jacob's sons, and now in the time after Jesus Christ whose coming they predicted. In the time after the patriarchs Moses had been commissioned to issue extra commandments for the obstinate Jews, but these were only intended for Israel, and valid only for a restricted period. The

coming of Jesus Christ, as bringer of salvation for Jews and gentiles, had rendered them superfluous. The descendants of the patriarchs should give heed to this: they, too, should accept and obey this saviour and concentrate on the essential commandments.

At the end of the Testaments, in T. Benj. 10,4-10, we read how at the last judgment Enoch, Noah, Shem, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob will rise from the dead together with the twelve sons of Jacob, "worshipping the King of heaven appearing on earth in the form of a humble man". All people will rise and be judged according to their response to this saviour, gentiles as well as Israelites. But the sons of Benjamin should know:

> But you, if you walk in holiness before the face of the Lord,
> you will again dwell safely with me;
> and all Israel will be gathered together unto the Lord (v. 11).

In Justin, Dial. 45,4; 80-81; 130,1-2 we find a similar description. "We gentiles will rejoice with his people; I mean: along with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and the prophets, indeed of all that people who live agreeable to God" (130,2).

Viewed against the background of what has just been said, the function of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs in early Christianity becomes clear. They formulate how in the time after Jesus Christ God's commandments have to be obeyed, indeed what was God's intention throughout the history of salvation. For Israel, too, it is this obedience that really matters; this is the message contained in the summons by the fathers of the twelve tribes, who also announce the salvation in Christ to Israel. The author(s) of the Testaments was/were clearly anxious about the fate of Israel; he/they wanted to urge the Jews to accept the message of Jesus Christ and to let themselves be persuaded by it. To this end he/they strikingly chose the form of a parenetical tract rather than that of a polemic, apologetic or missionary writing. The Testaments cannot simply be classified as "Adversus Judaeos" literature[79]—which probably is a misnomer anyway. Likewise, the Gospel of Matthew and Justin's Dialogue with Trypho, mentioned by Graham N. Stanton in his article "Aspects of Early Christian-Jewish Polemic and Apologetic",[80] cannot (or only from a very one-sided point of view) be considered as writings levelled against the Jews.[81]

In conclusion I may point to the somewhat different assessment of the evidence by Georg Kretschmar in a recent essay.[82] He regards the

Testaments as a Christian composition from the second century, at a later stage more than once interpolated by Christians (an in itself plausible supposition, but very hard to prove, as I have argued above). Kretschmar classifies the Testaments among the "crypto-Christian writings". He emphasizes that they were composed in Christian circles which could formulate, and recognize, their convictions in texts attributed to authors of Old Testament times. In these parting words of the sons of Jacob the message concerning Christ was contained, not in an overtly missionary fashion, but hidden, in the form of allusions and promises, only really understandable for insiders. In Kretschmar's view the Testaments stem from Hellenistic-Jewish Christian circles that put much emphasis on the continuity in the history of salvation. The process of interpolation, assumed by Kretschmar, shows, according to him, that the Testaments were also used by communities of a different background, and remained authoritative for main stream Christians of later generations.

Continuing study of the so-called Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament by Christians remains necessary. It is likely to result in an increasingly differentiated picture of the relations between Jews and Christians belonging to various streams in Christianity in the second and third centuries—and probably also later, in the period after Constantine when Christianity took up a central position in the Roman Empire.

NOTES

[1] *NedTTs*39 (1985), 265-275; see n. 4.

[2] SVTP 8; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1985. It is based on M. de Jonge *et alii, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Critical Edition of the Greek Text* (PVTG I,2; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1978).

[3] Helmut Merklein (ed.), *Neues Testament und Ethik. Für Rudolf Schnackenburg* (Freiburg-Basel-Wien: Herder, 1989), 538-550; see n. 4.

[4] D. Balch *et alii* (eds.), *Greeks, Romans and Christians. Essays in Honor of A. J. Malherbe* (Minneapolis: Fortress and Augsburg, 1990), 340-352. The articles on the Testaments just mentioned have now been incorporated in M. de Jonge, *Jewish Eschatology, Early Christian Christology and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Collected Essays* (NovTSup 63; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1991), 233-243; 277-289; 301-313 respectively.

[5] For details see the edition mentioned in n. 2.

[6] "La bibliothèque de Michel Choniatès et la tradition occidentale des Testaments des XII Patriarches" and "Additional notes on the history of MSS. Venice Bibl. Marc. Gr. 494 (*k*) and Cambridge Univ. Libr. Ff. 1.24 (*b*)" in M. de Jonge (ed.), *Studies on the*

Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (SVTP 3; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975), 97-106; 107-115.

[7] "Robert Grosseteste and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *JTS* N.S. 42 (1991), 115-125.

[8] Matthaeus Parisiensis, *Chronica Majora* (ed. H. R. Luard), IV, 232-233 and V, 284-287.

[9] For details see the article mentioned in n. 7, pp. 118-119.

[10] *Chron. Maj.* V, 285.

[11] "Testamenta duodecim Patriarcharum....quae per multa tempora incognita et abscondita fuerunt per invidiam Judaeorum, propter manifestas prophetias de Salvatore in eis contentas" (*Chron. Maj.* IV, 232).

[12] One has to assume translation from Hebrew into Greek if one starts from the thesis that the Testaments reproduce the words of Jacob's sons. Compare the introduction to the Testaments in Mt. Sinai, Monastery of St. Catherine, Cod. Gr. 547 (=770), ff. 1r.-70r., (s. XVII) = *h* and also in the codices *i* (no known number; ff. 1r.-38r.; s. XVII?) and *j* (Cod. Gr. 2170 [=608], ff. 8r.-88r; s. XVIII): Ἰωάννου τοῦ ποτε ἑβραίου εἴδησις τῶν διαθηκῶν τῶν ιβ′ υἱῶν τοῦ πατριάρχου Ἰακὼβ μεταφρασθεῖσα ἀπὸ ἰουδαικῶν διαλέκτου εἰς ἑλληνικήν. For further data see the Leiden *editio maior*, XIX-XXI. Cf. Oxford, Selden sup. ff. 232a-262a. from the fourteenth century, which does not mention Grosseteste's name. S. H. Thomson, *The Writings of Robert Grosseteste Bishop of Lincoln 1235-1253* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1940), 43: "The rubric reads: secundum translationem Johannis Crisostomi de hebreo in grecum". See also the Middle Dutch manuscripts mentioned in n. 27.

[13] Thus Matthew Paris, *Chron. Maj.* IV, 233. The colophon speaks of the prophecies, which "in maiorem confusionem Iudaeorum et omnium haereticorum et inimicorum Ecclesiae gloriosius prorumpant."

[14] See on this H. J. de Jonge, "Les fragments marginaux dans le MS. *d* des Testaments des XII Patriarches," in M. de Jonge (ed.), *Studies on the Testaments*, 87-96.

[15] *Commentaria in Quattuor Libros Sententiarum* IV = *Opera Omnia* IV (ed. Quaracchi, 1899), Dist. XXIX, Qu. II, p. 703.

[16] On Bacon see H. J. de Jonge, "Die Patriarchentestamente von Roger Bacon bis Richard Simon (mit einem Namenregister)" in M. de Jonge (ed.), *Studies on the Testaments*, 3-42.

[17] *Opus Majus* (ed. J. H. Bridges), Suppl. Vol., 71-72.

[18] *Opus Majus* (ed. J. H. Bridges), Vol. II, 391.

[19] *Roberti Grosseteste Episcopi quondam Lincolniensis Epistolae* (ed. H. R. Luard), Epistola V (pp. 33-38). For further details see my article mentioned in n. 7, 71-72.

[20] Relatively many Mss. omit passages. In a number of cases it is a matter of copying errors, but generally speaking this is not so. The copyists did not go about in a systematic way; probably they simply thought the expositions of the Testaments too long-winded. In Ms. *g* (=Patmos, Mon. Joh. Theol. Ms. 411, ff. 178r-220v; saec. XV) which contains many abbreviations, the writer now and then vents his feelings. He leaves out two lists of spirits in T.R. 2,2-9; after the introduction to the first list in T.R. 2,1 about "what I saw about the seven spirits of deceit when I repented", he writes: ἀρκεῖ μοι εἰς διδασκαλίαν ὑμῶν. Comparable is the omission of a passage in T.N. 2,2-8 about the correlation between body and spirit, ending in 2,9 with the exhortation to abide by the order of creation. The scribe of *g* makes Naphtali declare καὶ ἐποίουν τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ (Jacob is meant) κατὰ τάξιν, and then adds καὶ ἕτερά τινα πολλὰ φυσιογνωμικά before continuing with an adapted version

of v. 9. According to *L.Sc.J.,s.v.* φυσιογνωμία is "the science or art of judging a man by his features". For details, here and elsewhere, see the Leiden edition of the Testaments mentioned in note 2.

[21] Except in Mss. *b* and *d*, to be discussed presently, also in *chij* (Cod. Vat. Gr. 731, ff. 97r-166v; saec. XIII; and the three manuscripts of the Monastery of St. Catherine on the Sinai, already mentioned).

[22] So, too, the copy of *l*, Athos Laura K 116 (cat. no. 1403). *d* has Παῦλος and *k* (see below) περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Παύλου.

[23] On *d* see H. J. de Jonge, "Les fragments marginaux dans le MS. *d* ..." (note 14).

[24] Annotation of H. J. de Jonge at the collation: "Glosses of—perhaps—the writer of the MS. himself." The handwriting is in any case related.

[25] For a great number of further details see H. J. de Jonge's article "Les fragments marginaux dans le MS. *d*."

[26] Only the introductions to T. Dan and T. Benjamin do not mention that the patriarch spoke περὶ τοῦ χριστοῦ. At T.D. 5,8 there is a marginal note εἰς βαβυλῶνα λέγει clearly written by the writer of the Ms., just as the interesting remark at T. Jud. 25,1 (speaking about the resurrection of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob along with Jacob's twelve sons): ὅτε ἀνέστη ὁ χριστὸς συναναστήσας αὐτούς. Of many more such additions it cannot be established that they stem from the writer himself. At the end of T. Benjamin the writer continues with a quotation from Gen. 49,17-18 LXX and a short commentary on this. In a different handwriting there is in the margin an addition περὶ τοῦ ἀντιχριστοῦ.

[27] Nijmegen, Gemeentearchief, Weeshuis Ms. 956, pp. 3a-50a; Ms. 957, pp. 3a-63a and Deventer, Athenaeumbibliotheek Ms. I,42 (101D6), f. 247r-v ("fragment, 2 blz. van de inleiding in 2 kolommen", see Catalogue 1892). See also Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, VJ 17, mentioned by Th. Mertens (see n. 29). The beginning in Ms. 957 (cf. 956) reads: "Here begin the testaments of the twelve patriarchs the children of the patriarch Jacob after the translation by St John Goldenmouth from the hebrew language into the greek language and from the greek language into the latin language and finally from the latin language into the dutch language ("Hier beginnen die testamente der xij patriarchen kinder Jacobs des patriarchen na oversettinge sancte Iohans guldenmoint van ebreuscher tongen in grixser tongen ende van grixser tongen in latijnscher tongen ende ten lesten van latijnscher tongen in duytscher talen"). For John Chrysosostom see also n. 12.

[28] "Hier eyndet die sermone ende die testamente der xij patriarchen Jacobs kinder des patriarchen die si maecten inden lesten eynde oers leuens daer si in seggen een deel van oren leuen mit menigerhande goeden exempel end leer die si oren kinderen leerden end beualen te doen"—see Louise Sormani, *Inventaris van de Archieven van het Borgerkinderen-Weeshuis, het Arme-kinder-Weeshuis en de beide Weeshuizen te Nijmegen* (Nijmegen, Drukkerij Gebr. Jansen, 1951), 302. Besides, (in Mss. 956 and 957) also in the introduction: ".. ende prophetierden hem toecomende dinghen, die naemaels gheschien solden, van oen ende van oren naecomelijnghe" (E.T.: ".. and prophesied things that would happen to them, things that afterwards were to happen, about the end of their progeny").

[29] Th. Mertens, "Geestelijke testamenten in de laatmiddeleeuwse Nederlanden. Een verkenning van het genre," in G. R. W. Dibbets and P. W. M. Wackers (eds.), *Wat duikers vent is dit! Opstellen voor W. M. H. Hummelen* (Wijhe: Uitg. Quarto, 1989), 75-89, points out that many spiritual testaments from the late Middle Ages are known, also in particular from the circles of the Modern Devotion. On pp. 86-88 he gives a list of them

(with on p. 86 a reference to Ms. Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek VJ 17 of the Testaments, according to H. J. de Jonge a copy of the printed edition from after 1540).

[30] See A. Welkenhuysen, "Plantijns drukken van de Testamenten der XII Patriarchen (1561, 1564, 1566) in hun 'boekhistorische' context", *De Gulden Passer* 66-67 (1988-1989), 505-515, see especially p. 509.

[31] A. Welkenhuysen, "Plantijns drukken", 514. Compare the article by I. M. Veldman and H. J. de Jonge mentioned in the next note, p. 179.

[32] "Die testamenten der XII patriarchen Jacobs kinderen, hoe een yeghelick voer sijnen eynde sijn kinderen gheleert totter vreesen Godts ende Godtsalighen leven vermaent heeft. Oock hoe een yeghelick bysonder doer den propheetschen ghyest van Christo den waeren Messia (claerder dan dat licht) gethuyghet. Daer inne veel schooner leer ende troesticker toeseggingen van Christo begrepen sint seer troestelick ende tot eenen waren Godtsalighen leven gants dienstelick." See I. M. Veldman and H. J. de Jonge, "The sons of Jacob: the twelve patriarchs in sixteenth-century Netherlandish prints and popular literature," *Simiolus* 15 (1985), 176-196, esp. p. 178, n. 10 and the picture on p. 186.

[33] Reproduced in facsimile by A. Welkenhuysen.

[34] "Die Textüberlieferung der Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen", *ZNW* 63 (1972), 27-44 reprinted in *Studies* (n. 6), 45-62.

[35] "The Earliest Traceable Stage of the Textual Tradition of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs", *Studies*, 63-86.

[36] See S. P. Brock on p. 3 in S. P. Brock and J.-C. Picard, *Testamentum Jobi/Apocalypsis Baruch Graece* (PVTG 2; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976).

[37] F. Schmidt, *Le Testament grec d'Abraham* (TSAJ 11; Tübingen: Mohr, 1986), 6-10; 17-26.

[38] Mentioned in M. Philonenko, *Le testament de Job* (Semitica 18; Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1968), 61-63; cf. F. Schmidt, 40. See also C. Römer and H. J. Thissen, "P. Köln Inv. nr. 3221: Das Testament des Hiob in koptischer Sprache. Ein Vorbericht" in M. A. Knibb and P. W. van der Horst (eds.) *Studies on the Testament of Job* (SNTSMS 66; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 33-45. B. Schaller, in his *Das Testament Hiobs* (JSHRZ III 3; Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1979) made a first attempt to use the Coptic fragments textcritically. See also the "Introduction" by P. W. van der Horst and M. A. Knibb, in the volume just mentioned, especially p. 5: "The publication of this Sahidic version may indicate that a completely new edition of the Greek text will be required. It may turn out to be impossible to reconstruct an 'Urtext' because of the too great divergencies between the respective textual witnesses."

[39] "Zur armenischen Überlieferung der Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen" in C. Burchard-J. Jervell-J. Thomas, *Studien zu den Testamenten der Zwölf Patriarchen* (BZNW 36; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1969), 1-29.

[40] "New Evidence for the Armenian Version of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs", *RB* 84 (1977), 94-107, esp. p. 102. This article (as well as that mentioned in n. 48) can now be found in M. E. Stone, *Selected Studies in Pseudepigrapha and Apocrypha with Special Reference to the Armenian Tradition* (SVTP 9; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1991), 131-144 (see esp. p. 139).

[41] S. Lazarro 346 (1220); Jerusalem 1925 (1269); Erevan 1500 (1282/3); Bodl. Arm. e 30 (s. XII)—see Burchard, pp. 13-14.

[42] See M. E. Stone, "Armenian Canon Lists III—the Lists of Mechitar of Ayrivank' (c. 1285 C.E.," *HTR* 69 (1976), 289-300 and "New evidence", 102, with the conclusion: "It

seems safer, therefore, to abandon the use of this list as a witness to the existence of the Armenian version of the Testaments in the eleventh century."

[43] See, for what follows, M. de Jonge, "The Greek Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the Armenian Version", *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, 120-139.

[44] See M. de Jonge, "Textual Criticism and the Analysis of the Composition of the Testament of Zebulun," *Studies*, 144-160.

[45] *Studies*, p. 138.

[46] Full title: A. Hultgård, *L'eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches II. Composition de l'ouvrage. Textes et traductions* (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Historia Religionum 7; Uppsala 1982). See my review in *JSJ* 14 (1983), 70-80.

[47] Crucial is his preference for the shorter text in T. Zebulun; the longer one is, in his opinion, secondary. For that reason for him the most important dividing line is not that between *bk* and the other groups, but that between *bk* and *gldm* on the one hand and *eafn-chij*SNgr and A on the other.

[48] "The *EPITOME* of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *Revue des Études Arméniennes*, N.S. 20 (1986-1987), 69-107; see also the volume mentioned in n. 40, 145-183. In it he announces a second article "The Epitome of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs in Matenadaran No. 2679," to appear in the *Proceedings of the International Conference on Mediaeval Armenian Literature* (Erevan).

[49] As has been demonstrated by Hultgård and Stone. See also M. E. Stone, "The Armenian Version of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Selections of Manuscripts", *Sion* 49 (1975), beside "New Evidence," mentioned in n. 40.

[50] "The *EPITOME*," 75 (151).

[51] "The *EPITOME*," 76 (152).

[52] I have amply demonstrated this in my dissertation *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Study of their Text. Composition and Origin* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1953; [2]1975), 23-24. I should also like to draw attention to an observation J. Jervell made in his "Ein Interpolator interpretiert. Zu der christlichen Bearbeitung der Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen" (pp. 30-61 in the volume mentioned in n. 39). Jervell remarks that the Armenian version thoroughly modifies the pronouncements in the Testaments on the salvation of the nations and Israel. "Die armenische Übersetzung ist deshalb eine spätere christliche Übersetzung und Bearbeitung, für die das Verhältnis Israel und die Völker ohne Belang ist, für die die Testamente das Schicksal der Menschen überhaupt darstellen, m.a.W. Universalismus" (p. 40).

[53] James C. VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (HSM 14; Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1977), 94. See now also the introductions to his text and translation of Jubilees in *CSCO* 510-511 (Leuven: Peeters, 1989) and J. C. VanderKam and J. T. Milik, "The First Jubilees Manuscript from Qumran Cave 4: A Preliminary Publication," *JBL* 110 (1991), 243-270.

[54] M. A. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Enoch. A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls* II (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), 6-15. Knibb bases his judgment on the reconstruction of the texts in J. T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch, Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976).

[55] See M. A. Knibb in his review of M. Black (in consultation with James C. VanderKam), *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch. A New English Edition* (SVTP 7: Leiden E. J. Brill, 1985) in *JSJ* 17 (1986), 86-92, e.g. p. 92: "Black's translation is based not on the Ethiopic, nor on the Greek and Ethiopic, but on a combination of Ethiopic, Greek

and Aramaic. The Ethiopic and Greek represent essentially the same textual tradition, but it is questionable how far it is desirable to try to incorporate the Aramaic also in a single translation based primarily on the Ethiopic and the Greek in view of the fact that the Aramaic survives only in fragments, most of which are quite small, and that it often differs in minor, or even major, respects from the other witnesses."

[56] *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (see n. 52), 38-52.

[57] For details, see the publications mentioned in notes 58 and 59, in which it is also argued that a number of fragments of T. Judah and T. Joseph mentioned by J. T. Milik in his contribution "Écrits préesséniens de Qumrân: d'Hénoch à Amram" in M. Delcor (ed.), *Qumrân. Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* (BETL 46; Paris/Gembloux: Duculot/Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1978), 91-106, cannot be identified with certainty.

[58] *Commentary* (see n. 2), 17-29.

[59] F. García Martínez and É. Puech (eds.), *Mémorial Jean Carmignac. Études Qumrâniennes* (*R.d.Q.* 13; Paris: Gabalda, 1988), 367-385; see now my *Collected Essays* (n. 4), 244-262.

[60] *In Librum Jesu Nave Homiliae* 15,6 (ed. W. Baehrens, G.C.S., *Origenes VII 2*, Leipzig 1921).

[61] Ed. G. Morin, Anecdota Maredsolana III 3, Oxoniae 1903, now in C.C.L. 78, Turnhout 1958, p. 376: "In libro quoque Patriarcharum, licet inter apocryphos computetur, ita inveni: ut quomodo fel ad iracundiam, sic renes ad calliditatem et ad astutiam sint creati. Πανουργία autem id est calliditas...'. Cf. T.N. 2,8 ...χολὴν πρὸς πικρίαν ... νέφρους εἰς πανουργίαν.

[62] See on this e.g. H. W. Hollander and M. de Jonge, *Commentary*, 26-27; 185-186 (also for further bibliographical data).

[63] As has been demonstrated in detail by H. W. Hollander, *Joseph as an Ethical Model in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (SVTP 6; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1981), 16-49.

[64] Gradual growth of the Testaments is assumed (from a totally different perspective and with completely different results) but not, as far as I can see, proved by J. Becker, *Untersuchungen zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen* (AGJU 8; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970), and by A. Hultgård, *L'eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches* I (Acta Univ. Upsaliensis, Hist. Religionum 6, Uppsala 1977). Hultgård, however, discerns two stages in the Christian additions—see the second volume of his *L'eschatologie* (mentioned in n. 46), 228-238. He mostly adduces textcritical arguments, in the framework of his totally different view on the textual history of the document.

[65] "The Future of Israel in the Testaments of the Twelve Patrarchs", *JSJ* 17 (1986), 196-211; "Two Messiahs in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs" in J. W. van Henten *et alii* (eds.), *Tradition and Re-interpretation in Jewish and Early Christian Literature* (FS J. C. H. Lebram; SPB 36; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1986), 150-162. Compare "Test. Benjamin 3:8 and the picture of Joseph as "a good and holy man" " in J. W. van Henten *et alii* (eds.), *Die Entstehung der jüdischen Martyrologie* (SPB 38; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1989), 204-214. See now my *Collected Essays*, 164-179; 191-203 and 290-300 respectively.

[66] See his "The multiform Jewish heritage of Early Christianity" in J. Neusner (ed.), *Christianity, Judaism and other Greco-Roman Cults* (FS Morton Smith; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975), III, 174-179, esp. 184-185.

[67] See the survey in H. Dixon Slingerland, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical History of Research* (SBLMS 21; Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1977), 8-15.

[68] *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (see note 52), 125-126; the following quotation can be found on p. 125.

[69] So also A. Hultgård; after having pointed out a number of parallels between Christological pronouncements in writings from the second century and those in the Testaments, he concludes: "Puis, comme le rédacteur chrétien développe ou refond un texte antérieur, il est légitime de supposer une influence de la terminologie du texte primitif. Le caractère différent de certains passages christologiques des *Testaments* peut ainsi être expliqué" (*L'eschatologie* II, 235).

[70] See on this H. W. Hollander and M. de Jonge, *Commentary*, §8 "The Testaments in the early Christian Church" (pp. 67-82); M. de Jonge, "The Pre-Mosaic Servants of God in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and in the writings of Justin and Irenaeus", *VC* 39 (1985), 157-170 and "Hippolytus' 'Benedictions of Isaac, Jacob and Moses' and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs", *Bijdragen* 46 (1985), 245-260. See now my *Collected Essays*, 263-376 and 204-219 respectively.

[71] See the article on Hippolytus mentioned in the preceding note and also "Two Interesting Interpretations of the Rending of the Temple-veil in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs", *Bijdragen* 46 (1985), 350-362 (= *Collected Essays*, 220-232).

[72] See his *Joseph as an Ethical Model in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (see n. 63), "Conclusion" (pp. 93-97).

[73] J. J. Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem. Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora* (New York: Crossroad, 1983), 137-174. The quotation in the text is from p. 156.

[74] Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr, *Gesetz und Paränese. Katechismusartige Weisungsreihen in der frühjüdischen Literatur* (WUNT II 28; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1987).

[75] As, of course, has been known all along to readers of the Epistle of James, the Shepherd of Hermas and other Christian writings such as the Sentences of Sextus.

[76] See n. 4. See also my earlier article "Testament Issachar als 'typisches' Testament", in *Studies*, 291-316, esp. 311-314.

[77] On this see also my essay "Die Paränese in den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und in den Testamenten der Zwölf Patriarchen", mentioned in n. 3.

[78] See my article "The Pre-Mosaic Servants of God in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the Writings of Justin and Irenaeus", mentioned in n. 70; compare H. W. Hollander and M. de Jonge, *Commentary*, §8.3 (pp. 71-76).

[79] See H. Schreckenberg, *Die christlichen Adversus-Judaeos-Texte und ihr literarisches und historisches Umfeld (1.-11.Jh.)* (Europ. Hochschulschriften 23, Bd. 172: Frankfurt a.M.-Bern-New York-Paris: Peter Lang, ²1990).

[80] *NTS* 31 (1985), 377-392.

[81] On the Dialogue with Trypho, see "The Pre-Mosaic Servants of God", 165-166.

[82] "Die Kirche aus Juden und Heiden. Forschungsprobleme der ersten christlichen Jahrhunderte", in J. van Amersfoort and J. van Oort (eds.), *Juden und Christen in der Antike* (Kampen: Kok, 1990), 9-43, esp. 31-35. The author refers to an earlier article "Die Bedeutung der Liturgiegeschichte für die Frage nach der Kontinuität des Judenchristentums in nachapostolischer Zeit" in M. Simon (ed.), *Aspects du Judéochristianisme* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1965), 113-137, esp. 123-125 where he discusses T. Levi 8.

2318 VE *Leiden*, Libellenveld 19